

**Remarks/Arguments:**

**Objection to the claims.**

Claims 5-8 stand objected for the following informalities: Misspelling of the word "thereon" in claim 5. Claim 5 has been amended to correct this. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 5 is, therefore, respectfully requested.

**Rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.**

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,552,660 hereinafter Lisowski. Such rejection is respectfully traversed because Lisowski does not teach either directly or inherently all the claimed elements of the present invention. Specifically the Lisowski reference does not teach a *"wake up circuit comprises a flexure sensor adapted to switch the electronic alarm activation circuit from a first, dormant state to a second, active state."*

Lisowski teaches the use of a flexible printed circuit for igniting a flexible smoke/dye marking pack contained in a flexible currency simulating pack. As Lisowski states the flexible pack may be ignited through a reed switch or contain an antenna for receiving an ignition signal.

As explained in the specification, *"According to this invention there is provided a wake-up circuit for use in a flexible security pack comprising an electronic activation system to switch the electronic activation system from a first, dormant state to a second, active state. The wake up circuit comprises a transducer sensitive to flexure of the security pack, for generating an output signal. The transducer is connected to an electrical switching circuit adapted to switch the electronic activation circuit from the first, dormant state to the second, active state."*

As further explained in the specification, in the prior art section, prior art security packs (including the Lisowski pack) almost invariably include primary electronic circuitry designed to receive an activation signal to initiate the ignition of the chemicals and electronic wake-up circuitry designed to remove the primary circuitry from a standby condition in which the circuitry is in effect turned off and insensitive to the activation signal, to an active condition where the primary electronic circuit is sensitive to the activation signal.

In practice the security packs are kept in drawers next to the bank tellers and are mixed in with the real money given to a robber. The wake up circuitry heretofore has been a mercury type switch that is sensitive to motion, or a reed switch held to an open position by a magnetic plate on which the security pack is kept. In both cases the wake up circuitry is susceptible to inadvertent actuation as a result of slight nudging of the pack in the drawer, or inadvertent removal of the pack from the magnetic receptacle. While most activation systems will return to the standby position after a minute or two unless they subsequently receive an activation signal, such wake-up cycling results in premature discharge of the battery powering the security pack electronics.

All that is shown in Lisowski is a prior art wake up circuit placed on a flexible printed circuit. There is nothing either directly or inherently present in Lisowski that would suggest replacing the well established wake up circuit activation reed switch with a flexible switch that is activated not by simple movement but following flexure of the security package. The flexure which will usually take place when the teller picks up the security package and places in the robber's bag is not an action that may occur inadvertently. Thus the present invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Lisowski disclosure.

Claims 2 and 4 are claims dependent of claim 1 and as such include the limitations of claim 1 and are not anticipated by Lisowski for the same reasons claim 1 is not. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1,2 and 4 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Rejection of claims 3, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).**

Claims 3, and 9-14 stand rejected as obvious in view of Lisowski taken over Williams, (2003/0184438). Claims 3 and 9-11 depend of claim 1 and should also be allowed as dependent claims.

Claims 12 and 13 are method claims that require the steps of providing a flexure sensor in a security pack and flexing the sensor to shift an electronic circuit in the security pack from a dormant state to a standby state where the circuit may be further activated to activate the actual alarm circuit.

The Examiner admits that the primary reference does not teach or suggest the presence and/or use of a flexure detector or a step of flexing the package for switching the alarm circuit from a dormant state to an active state. Williams is therefore proposed to fill the gap.

Williams describes a sensor system for the protection of a safe or ATM. It involves the use of a flexible sensor (such as a piezo-electric sensor) to detect movement. That is what the piezo-electric sensor is designed to do – detect movement. In the 3SI application however, the piezo-electric sensor is used in a new and unique way for a specific application – that of a currency pack used to deter theft. The piezo-electric sensor is used to differentiate between just any movement, and actual flexure of the currency pack. It is intended to replace previous designs (which typically use a mercury type sensor or magnetic reed switch) that only detect that the currency pack has been moved. The new flexure activated design differentiates between physical movements (such as when the currency pack is in a money drawer that is opened/closed), and when the currency pack is actually being picked up and handled (as in a robbery situation).

While Williams does cite the use of a piezo-electrical device, it is only used in the conventional manner for which this device is designed: IE mechanical motion of the object produces an electrical output from the device. This output is then used to create an alarm state when used with the stated devices for which this patent is designed: Safe, ATM, and other devices specified in par. [0044] (sheet of reinforced glass for a secure room; a floor panel in a secure room). This is absolutely no suggestion to its use within a currency pack used to deter robbery.

Therefore, the steps of providing a flexure sensor and of flexing the sensor to wake up the alarm circuit from a dormant state are not shown by a combination of the teachings of Lisowski with Williams, particularly in view of the state of the art prior to this invention as described in the prior art section of this application. Such combination would rather lead to the placement of a transducer somewhere in the drawer with co-operating circuitry in the security package to detect removal of the security package from the drawer much as the prior art teaches. At best it may be said that the combination may induce someone to try employing a flexible sensor in the security pack itself for detecting not the pack motion or removal from the drawer, however when at best, in view of these disclosures, one skilled in the art "*might find it*

Appln. No.:10/656,519  
Amendment Dated May 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 1, 2005

3SI-139US

*obvious to try various combinations.... this is not the standard of 35 U.S.C. § 103". (In re Fine 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed.Cir. 1988); In re Geiger 2 USPQ2d 1276,1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987).*

For the foregoing reasons Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims still pending in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Costas S. Krikelis, Reg. NO. 28,028  
Attorney for Applicants

CSK:rc

Dated: May 2, 2005

RatnerPrestia

☐ P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

☒ P.O. Box 1596  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
(302) 778-2500


Appln. No.:10/656,519  
Amendment Dated May 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 1, 2005

3SI-139US

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

May 2, 2005



Ruth Curran